Who's Got the Time?: The Relationships Between Household Labor Time and Coital Frequency

Constance T. Gager

&

Scott T. Yabiku

Department of Sociology
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 874802, 5681 Coor Hall
Tempe, AZ 85287-4802

Abstract

Although prior research has examined the relationships between marital satisfaction and household labor, equity, and time use, few have examined a dimension of marital quality that requires time: coital frequency. Motivated by the trend of men and women spending more time in paid labor and the general speed up of everyday life (Gleick 1999; Schor 1991), we explore how the resulting time crunch affects coital frequency among married and cohabiting couples. We test two competing hypotheses using the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Our results contradict the opportunity hypothesis that time spent on household labor reduces the opportunity for coital frequency. We find support for a new hypothesis suggesting that women who "work hard" also "play hard," as our results show women who spend more hours in unpaid and paid labor report higher coital frequency. We find no significant relationship between men's household labor and sexual frequency.

Introduction

Many researchers have examined the relationship between the division of household labor and marital satisfaction. These studies document that an unequal division of labor decreases perceived fairness of the division of household labor and marital happiness, especially for employed wives (Blair and Johnson 1992; Greenstein 1996b; Pina and Bengston 1993; Sanchez 1994; Suitor 1991; Voydanoff and Donnelly 1999). Coital frequency is another important dimension of marital satisfaction as most studies find that couples who are happier have higher rates of sexual frequency (Blumstein and Schwartz; Call, Sprecher and Schwartz 1995; Doddridge, Schumm, and, Bergen 1987; Edwards and Booth 1994; Rao and DeMaris 1995). Although a few studies have explored the effect of perceived marital equity on sexual frequency, no studies have examined the relationship between the division of household labor and sexual frequency. This is an important omission as marital equity and happiness are not time dependent while coital frequency is a dimension of marital happiness that requires time. Therefore, one might expect that the relationship between household labor hours and coital frequency may be stronger, unlike the heretofore relationship between household labor and happiness, which have generally been weak.

Although coital frequency has been examined by researchers from a wide variety of perspectives, only a few variables are consistently found to predict it. This core set of predictors encompass several demographic factors including marriage or cohabitation status, age, and marital duration. Most research documents that frequency of sex is higher among those who are married or cohabiting (Michael et al. 1994) and lower among older couples and those in longer marital unions (James 1974; Jasso 1985; Rao and DeMaris 1995; Udry 1993; Udry and Morris

1978; Westoff 1974). Declines in coital frequency by age and marital duration are attributed to the aging process and include increases in illness and decreases in male physical ability and male and female hormone levels, but cannot adequately explain the pattern of the decline (Greenblat 1983; Udry, Deven, and Coleman 1982). For example, research suggests that much of the decline occurs early in marriage (even in the first year) and is attributed to habituation, which is defined as the loss of interest or novelty of a sexual partner (James 1974, 1981). Estimates of average monthly marital coital frequency vary from 6.4 times per month (Call et al. 1995) to seven times per month (Michael et al. 1994).

To date, little research attention has been paid to marital coital frequency (Call et al. 1995) and the research has been plagued by several data problems. First, much of the previous research on marital coital frequency has relied on small, non-representative, convenience samples (Blumstein and Schwartz 1983; James 1974; Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin 1948, Kinsey et al. 1953). Second, only a few predictors, age and marital duration, are found to be significant across studies using various data collection methods. Although additional predictors of coital frequency have been identified and examined, the reported significance is suspect due to reliance on nonprobability samples (Blumstein and Schwartz 1983; James 1974; Kinsey et al. 1948, 1953).

More recently, a few scholars using newly available nationally representative datasets have identified several important correlates of coital frequency among cohabitors and married couples (Call et al. 1995; Laumann et al. 1994; Michael et al. 1994; Rao and Demaris 1995). Call et al. (1995) have persuasively argued that sexual frequency within marriage might be attributed to particular life changes that are associated with decreased or increased opportunities for sex. These so-called opportunity variables, including time spent in paid labor, caring for young

children, or balancing complicated schedules, may minimize the time or energy available for coital frequency. They find as hypothesized, that the presence of young children significantly decreases coital frequency. In addition, in Table 2 of their paper, they report a significant and positive coefficient between paid work and coital frequency, which is contrary to the opportunity hypothesis. However, in their discussion of these results, they report no significant effect of paid work on coital frequency. Thus, more research is needed to provide an accurate estimation of this relationship. In addition, this research was conducted on the first wave of the NSFH, collected in 1987.

In the current paper, we seek to update previous research using both the first and second waves of the NSFH and extend previous research by testing a new opportunity variable: time spent on household labor. We argue that a focus on household labor is particularly salient given changing norms regarding the appropriate roles for men and women in American society, which have fueled changes in the division of labor among married and cohabiting couples. Since the 1960s, the U.S. has witnessed unprecedented social change evidenced by significant increases in the numbers of married women and mothers entering the paid labor force. Many expected that men would increase their participation in household labor in closer tandem with women's increasing labor force participation (Gershuny and Robinson 1988), but those expectations have not come to fruition. Although the proportion of time spent on household labor by men has increased, decomposition analyses demonstrate that much of this change is attributable to decreases in the time women spend on household labor (Artis and Pavalko 2003; Bianchi et al. 2000). Thus, it is generally accepted that despite major changes in the participation of married mothers in the labor force over the past 40 years, the division of household labor remains unequal, with wives performing more household labor than their male counterparts even when

they are employed full time (England and Farkas 1986; Lennon and Rosenfield 1994; Shelton and John 1996).

Several approaches have framed previous analyses of the division of labor and shed light on our analysis. According to the time availability approach, the division of household labor within a family results from different constraints on each family member's time. The theory has been used primarily to consider how paid employment constrains wives' and husbands' available time for household labor (Coverman 1985; England and Farkas 1986). However, research using the time availability approach has failed to fully explain variation in the time spent in household labor as significant gender differences persist even among dual-earner couples. For example, while findings demonstrate that full-time employed wives do less housework than full-time housewives, wives in dual-earner couples still perform about two-thirds of the household labor. In sum, time alone cannot explain the division of housework (Ferree 1991).

The gender perspective offers an explanation for the persistence of an unequal division of household labor. This perspective focuses on the symbolic and often gendered meanings embedded in family labor. Thus, researchers using this perspective focus on the negotiations and meanings embedded in the division of labor (Coltrane 1996; Ferree 1991; Hochschild 1989). For example, West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that as wives do more housework and husbands do less, they establish and reinforce boundaries between men's and women's work. Much of the previous work using this perspective documents significant gender differences in the division of labor as well as the larger meaning of marriage. Some researchers argue that such gender differences lead to "his" and "hers" marriages (Bernard 1972). Although we might expect gender differences in desire for sex, since marital coital frequency occurs between two people, estimates should and are found to be similar (Smith, Morgan, and Gager 1994). We certainly expect that

women's higher participation in housework should have a greater effect on coital frequency compared with men.

The focus of this analysis is to explore how the resulting time crunch affects coital frequency among couples. Hochschild (1989, 1997) has described how the resulting "time bind" plays out among couples, especially focusing on how couples' negotiations over their division of labor influences their marital satisfaction. We examine whether these multiple demands on men's and women's time influences their time and energy availability for sex. Previous studies have documented that the division of labor is linked to measures of marital satisfaction. For example, quantitative researchers have used a variety of data sets to document that an unequal division of household labor negatively affects perceived fairness in the division of labor (Blair and Johnson 1992; Demo and Acock 1993; Greenstein 1996b; Lennon and Rosenfield 1994; Sanchez 1994) and that perceived fairness affects marital satisfaction (Frisco and Williams 2003; Gager 1998; Greenstein 1996b; Suitor 1991; Voydanoff and Donnelly 1999). However, objective measures of the time spent on household labor has not been shown to directly influence marital happiness (Greenstein 1996b; Perry-Jenkins and Folk 1994; Voydanoff and Donnelly 1999). What remains unclear is how time spent on household labor affects other measures of marital quality or interaction. Thus, no research to date has assessed the link between the division of household labor and coital frequency.

Based on previous theoretical and empirical research on the division of household labor and time use more generally, we propose two alternative hypotheses about the link between household time and the frequency of sexual relations. Based on the time availability approach, we would expect that increased time spent on household labor and in paid employment will curtail available time for sexual activity. Partners may simply not find the time to have sex if

they are working long hours outside or inside the home, and especially if they have young children. On the other hand, a few previous studies suggest there may be a tendency toward being a "go getter" across multiple activities. For example, Hochschild (1989) describes the supermom who does it all. In addition, recent research on time use among adolescents finds evidence for a group of "superkids"-- adolescents who devote longer hours to paid work, extracurricular activities, and housework (Gager and Sanchez 2004). This research suggests that there may be an underlying trait toward being an achiever across multiple spheres. Thus, according to the old adage, individuals who "work hard" also "play hard." In other words, there may be a group of individuals who "do it all" and a group who does not. According to this conception we would expect that husbands and wives who spend more hours on housework and paid wok hours may also have higher coital frequency.

We also hypothesize that the relationship between household labor time and coital frequency will vary by gender as previous research on the division of household labor finds that gender is a key predictor of time spent on housework and child care (Blair and Johnson 1992; Gager 1998; Sanchez 1994; Twiggs, McQuillan, and Ferree 1999). Research suggests that there is a greater expectation for women and girls to multitask across family, work, and other spheres (Gager 1998; Gager and Sanchez, 2004). Thus we expect the relationship between unpaid work time and coital frequency may be stronger for women than for men. We might also expect that because men spend longer hours in paid labor, a stronger relationship could exist between paid work time and coital frequency.

In sum, this research will examine whether time spent on housework is linked with lower or higher coital frequency and whether this association varies by gender. Thus, we will include hours spent on female household tasks, defined as those that are most time consuming and more

likely performed by women. In addition, we will investigate previously tested opportunity variables including time spent in paid labor and presence of children in the household as predictors of coital frequency in the past month. Further, we will include age and marital or cohabiting duration in the analyses as they have been shown to significantly affect coital frequency across many studies. We expect higher age and longer relationship duration will be associated with lower coital frequency.

The models will also incorporate several variables used in previous research on coital frequency, although they have not had significant effects across all studies. First, we include gender ideology in our models, expecting that more traditional women might likely spend more time on household labor, and they might have higher coital frequency because they believe it is their duty to their husbands. We also will include a measure of self-reported health because poor health could interfere with both the ability to perform manual household labor and engage in sexual activity. Better health is expected to be associated with higher coital frequency. Last we include a set of control variables including religious affiliation, race/ethnicity, education level, and family income. This research extends previous research by testing the effect of a new measure of the opportunity for sex and utilizing a concrete behavioral outcome that is likely influenced by the time bind.

Data and Methods

In our analyses, we employ the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) to assess whether time spent on household labor significantly affects coital frequency. We regress reports of coital frequency in the first wave of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) on a set of predictors from the first wave of the NSFH. Although our preliminary analyses do not use the later waves of the NSFH, we plan further analyses to utilize the longitudinal

dimension of these data. The question on coital frequency reads: About how often did you and your husband/wife have sex during the past month? The scale for this survey question is the number of times, from 0 up to a maximum of 95. We transform this frequency measure with a logarithmic function.

We choose our set of predictors based on previous research and our hypotheses. Most importantly we include a new opportunity variable: time spent on the most time-consuming female household tasks. These include hours spent in the last week preparing meals, washing dishes, cleaning house, shopping, and washing/ironing. In addition, we test additional opportunity variables examined in previous research: hours per week spent in paid work and number of children. Age and relationship duration are included given the consistent findings that older age and longer relationship duration are associated with less coital frequency. We also include variables shown to be correlated with marital sexual frequency including religion, race/ethnicity, family income, education level, and self-rated health (Call et al. 1994; Michael et al. 1994). Our analytic strategy is to use linear regression to model coital frequency with household tasks, gender ideology, paid work hours, and the controls as predictors.

Data Limitations

Although subject to social desirability bias (Leridon 1996) researchers have gained confidence that reports of coital frequency are valid and fairly reliable (Smith, Morgan, and Gager 1994). This confidence comes from a set of empirical observations. First, respondents have been willing to provide answers. Second, frequency distributions seem reasonable and consistent with distributions obtained using other data collection procedures such as diaries or interviews (Kinsey et al. 1948; 1953). Some expected correlates of coital frequency are

confirmed across studies using a variety of data collection techniques. For instance, in all surveys, mean coital frequency declines with age and marital duration.

Recall is one potential problem with these retrospective reports of coital frequency. For example, Udry (1993) has argued that the use of a diary for data collection is superior to retrospective reports, especially when trying to map out the rhythmic aspects of coitus. He contends that respondents answer the retrospective question concerning *monthly* coital frequency by looking back over the past week, counting how often they had intercourse and then multiplying that number by 4. Note in Figure 1 that there is "heaping" on 4, 8 and 12 times per month but also on 10, 15, and 20 (multiples of 5). Thus, we cannot see a clear pattern of bias and again we find similar monthly averages to data collected via other methods.

Figure 1 here

Missing data

To address missing data we use multiple imputation techniques (Allison 2002). The critical assumption for this missing data is that the data are missing at random (MAR), conditional on other non-missing attributes. Although this assumption cannot be tested, the assumption can be strengthened by including all relevant predictors in an imputation model. In our multiple imputation approach, we created 10 complete datasets. We then analyzed the imputed datasets with complete-data methods. The results of these complete-data analyses were combined to arrive at a single estimate that properly incorporates the uncertainty in the imputed values. We used SAS PROC MI and PROC MIANALYZE to create the datasets and combine the multiple analyses.

Results

(Table 1 here)

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics for the variables in our analysis by sex of partner. We briefly point out some important similarities and differences between men and women. For the dependent outcome, monthly coital frequency, men and women had similar reports: women had a frequency of about 7.6 times per month, while men reported 7.3 times per month. Weekly hours in household tasks, however, differed greatly by sex. In all of the five household tasks, women's reported hours exceeded that of men's. Some of the biggest disparities were in preparing meals, where women spent 7 more hours per week on this chore compared with men. In terms of relative comparison, washing and ironing were also highly unequal, with women reporting almost five times as many hours in this activity than men. Overall, women in our sample reported spending about 35 hours in the five household tasks, and men reported spending only 11 hours.

The results for gender ideology show that men were slightly more traditional with respect to gender roles than women. This concept was measured with a scale that was coded higher for more traditional beliefs. Men scored 13.2, compared to 12.3 for women, indicating generally similar gender ideologies. Hours spent last week in paid employment, however, differed substantially. Women averaged only 19 hours, whereas men averaged nearly 34 hours in the paid labor force. These work hours may seem low, but note that our sample contains all married and cohabiting couples in the NSFH, regardless of work or retirement status.

Among the remaining measures, there was little difference by sex. Men and women averaged almost 16 years in their current relationship (either their current marriage or cohabitation), although the majority of these respondents (91%) were in marriages. Both men and women reported their health as "good" or an average of 4 on the 5-point scale. Men were

older and had slightly higher education levels, but there were few differences in race, children born, religion, and income.

(Table 2 here)

Table 2 presents our preliminary analyses of the relationship between housework and coital frequency for women. In Model 1, we examine the total relationship between hours spent in housework and coital frequency. The results show a significant positive association. When women spent more time doing household labor, they reported higher coital frequency. Although the coefficient appears small (.002), recall that the dependent variable has been logged and thus its range has been compressed. In model 1, we used the summary measures of total hours in household labor instead of the individual tasks. This summary measure had an alpha of .78, and thus we believe it captures an underlying dimension of household labor measured by the five task items.

Note that this positive association between household tasks and coital frequency persists even in the presence of several controls that might be related to both housework and coital frequency. Most prominent of these controls is self-rated health, because poor health might interfere with the ability to perform manual household labor and engage in sexual activity. Although self-rated health has the expected positive and significant association with coital frequency, household labor also is significant.

We hypothesized that gender ideology might explain associations between household labor and coital frequency. More traditional women might be more likely to do more household labor, and they might have higher coital frequency because they believe it is their duty. This possibility is examined in Model 2 when we add a gender ideology scale. Gender ideology has an effect in the expected direction—with more traditional women doing more housework—but

this effect is not significant, nor does it reduce the association between housework and coital frequency.

Time in the paid labor force is another potential explanation between household labor and coital frequency. According to time availability theory, we hypothesized that women who have extensive demands in the paid labor force might have less time to devote to both household labor and coital frequency. Thus including paid labor in the model should reduce the associations between household labor and coital frequency. Model 3, however, does not support this hypothesis. Time in the paid labor force is positive associated with coital frequency—women who spend more hours at work report more sex. In addition, the coefficient for household work does not decrease, and in fact slightly grows in magnitude. In Model 4 we estimate a combined model with household labor, gender ideology, and hours in the paid labor force, but results are similar to previous models: both household work hours and paid labor force hours are positively and significantly associated with coital frequency. These findings support our alternative hypothesis – that individuals may be achievers across multiple spheres.

(Table 3 here)

In Table 3, we present our preliminary analyses of the relationship between housework and sexual frequency for men in our sample. As expected, we find differences in the magnitude and significance of associations between our independent variables and coital frequency. Although household labor time has a significant effect on coital frequency among women, we find no significant association for men. This result is likely due to the fact that men spend less time on household labor. However, similar to women, self-rated health and marital status (married or cohabiting) has significant associations. In Models 2 and 3, gender ideology and hours in paid employment show no association with coital frequency. In sum, the analysis of

men show very different relationships compared with the analysis of women, as household tasks are unrelated to men's coital frequency.

Conclusion and Next Steps

In sum, we have examined the relationship between coital frequency and a new opportunity variable: time spent on female household tasks. We presented competing hypotheses regarding the relationship between these two variables. Our findings suggest that time availability theory does not explain the relationship between these variables. The results for women show that women who work longer hours in unpaid and paid labor report higher coital frequency than those who devote less time to these spheres, which is in direct contradiction to time availability. Thus, we find support for our alternative hypothesis that individuals, at least women, "work hard" also "play hard." This finding coincides with previous research on women and adolescents who appear to multitask successfully across multiple spheres (Gager 1998; Gager and Sanchez 2004). We also confirm our hypothesis that the association of coital frequency and the division of household labor varies by gender, as household labor time has no effect on men's coital frequency. We attribute this finding to men's lesser participation in unpaid labor. However, we do not find support for our contention that men's paid labor would be associated with coital frequency.

In future analyses, we plan to replicate these models using the second wave of the NSFH. To better utilize the longitudinal design of the NSFH, we also intend to examine whether change in the division of labor or employment status is associated with change in coital frequency.

References

Allison, P. D. 2002. *Missing Data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Artis, J. E. and E. K. Pavalko. 2003. "Explaining the Decline in Women's Household Labor: Individual Change and Cohort Differences." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65: 746-61.

Bernard, J. S. 1972. *The Future of Marriage.* New York: World Publishers.

Bianchi, S. M., M. A. Milkie, L. C. Sayer, and J. P. Robinson. 2000. "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79:191-228.

Blair, S. L. and M. P. Johnson. 1992. "Wives' Perceptions of the Fairness of the Division of Household Labor: The Intersection of Housework and Ideology." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54: 570-81.

Blumstein, P. and P. Schwartz. 1983. *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex.* New York: William Morrow.

Call, V., S. Sprecher, and P. Schwartz. 1995. "The Incidence and Frequency of Marital Sex in a National Sample." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57: 639-52.

Coltrane, S. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coverman, S. 1985. "Explaining Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor." *The Sociological Quarterly* 26: 81-97.

Demo, D. H. and A. C. Acock. 1993. "Family Diversity and the Division of Domestic Labor: How Much Have Things Really Changed?" *Family Relations* 42: 323-31.

Doddridge, R., W. R. Schumm, and M.B. Bergen. 1987. "Factors Related to Decline in Preferred Frequency of Sexual Intercourse among Young Couples." *Psychological Reports* 60: 391-95.

Edwards, J. N. and A. Booth. 1994. "Sexuality, Marriage, and Well-Being: The Middle Years." Pp. 233-59 in *Sexuality Across the Life Course*, edited by A. S. Rossi. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

England, P. and G. Farkas. 1986. *Households, Employment, and Gender. A Social, Economic, and Demographic View.* New York: Aldine.

Ferree, M. M. 1991. "The Gender Division of Labor in Two-Earner Marriages: Dimensions of Variability and Change." *Journal of Family Issues* 12: 158-80.

Frisco, M. L. and K. Williams. 2003. “Perceived Housework Equity, Marital Happiness, and Divorce in Dual-Earner Households.” *Journal of Family Issues* 24: 51-73.

Gager, C. T. 1998. “The Role of Valued Outcomes, Justifications, and Comparison Referents in Perceptions of Fairness among Dual-Earner Couples.” *Journal of Family Issues* 19: 622-48.

Gager, C. T. and L. Sanchez. 2004. “Whose Time is It? The Effect of Gender, Employment, and Work/Family Stress on Children's Housework.” Paper Presentation. Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.

Gershuny, J. and J. P. Robinson. 1988. “Historical Changes in the Household Division of Labor.” *Demography* 25: 537-52.

Gleick, J. 1999. *Faster: The Acceleration of Just About Everything.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Greenblat, C. S. 1983. “The Salience of Sexuality in the Early Years of Marriage.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45: 289-99.

Greenstein, T. N. (1996b). “Gender Ideology and Perceptions of the Fairness of the Division of Labor: Effects on Marital Quality.” *Social Forces* 58: 1029-42.

Hochschild, A. R. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home.* New York: Viking.

Hochschild, A. R. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

James, W. H. 1974. “Marital Coital Rates, Spouses’ Ages, Family Size and Social Class.” *Journal of Sex Research* 10: 205-18.

James, W. H. 1981. “The Honeymoon Effect on Marital Coitus.” *Journal of Sex Research* 17: 114-23.

Jasso, G. 1985. “Marital Coital Frequency and the Passage of Time: Estimating the Separate Effects of Spouse's Ages and Marital Duration, Birth and Marriage Cohorts, and Period Influences.” *American Sociological Review* 50: 224-41.

Kinsey, A. C., W. B. Pomeroy, and C. E. Martin. 1948. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male.* Philadelphia: Saunders.

Kinsey, A. C., W. B. Pomeroy, C. E. Martin, and P. H. Gebhard. 1953. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.* Philadelphia: Saunders.

Laumann, E. O., J. H. Gagnon, R. T. Michael, and S. Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lennon, M. C. and S. Rosenfield. 1994. “Relative Fairness and the Division of Housework: The Importance of Options.” *American Journal of Sociology* 100: 506-31.

Leridon, H. 1996. “Coital Frequency: Data and Consistency Analysis.” Pp. 203-26 in *Sexuality and the Social Sciences: A French Survey on Sexual Behaviour*, edited by M. Bozon and H. Leridon. Aldershot, England: Dartmouth.

Michael, R. T., J. H. Gagnon, E. O. Laumann, and G. Kolata. 1994. *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. Boston: Little.

Perry-Jenkins M. and K. Folk. 1994. “Class, Couples, and Conflict: Effects of the Division of Labor on Assessments of Marriage in Dual-Earner Families.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56: 165-80.

Pina, D. L. and V. L. Bengtson. 1993. “The Division of Household Labor and Wives' Happiness: Ideology, Employment, and Perceptions of Support.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55: 901-912.

Rao, K. V. and A. DeMaris. 1995. “Coital Frequency among Married and Cohabiting Couples in the United States.” *Journal of Biosocial Science* 27: 135-50.

Sanchez, L. 1994. “Gender, Labor Allocations, and the Psychology of Entitlement within the Home.” *Social Forces* 73: 533-53.

Schor, J. B. 1991. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure.* New York: Basic Books.

Shelton, B. A. and D. John. 1996. “The Division of Household Labor.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 299-322.

Smith, H. L., S. P. Morgan, and C. T. Gager. 1994. “Comparing Spousal Reports From the NSFH: Husbands’ and Wives’ Reports of Coital Frequency.” Paper Presentation. Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles.

Suitor, J. J. 1991. “Marital Quality and Satisfaction With the Division of Household Labor Across the Family Life Cycle.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53: 221-30.

Twiggs, J. E., J. McQuillan, and M. M. Ferree. 1999. “Meaning and Measurement: Reconceptualizing Measures of the Division of Household Labor.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 712-24.

Udry, J. R. 1993. "Coitus as Demographic Behavior." Pp. 85-97 in *Biomedical and Demographic Determinants of Reproduction*, edited by R. Gray, H. Leridon, and A. Spira. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Udry, J. R., F. R. Deven, and S. J. Coleman. 1982. “A Cross-National Comparison of the Relative Influence of Male and Female Age on the Frequency of Marital Intercourse.” *Journal of Biosocial Science* 14: 1-6.

Udry, J. R. and N. M. Morris. 1978. “Relative Contribution of Male and Female Age to the Frequency of Marital Intercourse.” *Social Biology* 25: 128-34.

Voydanoff, P. and B. W. Donnelly. 1999. “The Intersection of Time in Activities and Perceived Unfairness in Relation in Psychological Distress and Marital Quality.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 739-751.

West, C. and D. H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” *Gender & Society* 1: 125-51.

Westoff, C. F. 1974. “Coital Frequency and Contraception.” *Family Planning Perspectives* 6: 136-41.

Table 1: Descriptive Statsitics by Sex

	Women		Men	
	Mean	Std.Dev	Mean	Std.Dev
Monthly coital frequency	7.57	7.54	7.32	7.15
Weekly hours on household tasks				
Preparing meals	10.63	7.51	3.10	4.36
Washing dishes	7.01	6.47	2.63	4.32
Cleaning house	9.40	8.73	2.48	3.89
Shopping	3.33	3.70	1.88	2.70
Washing/ironing	4.80	4.70	1.03	2.07
Total	35.17	23.16	11.11	13.50
Gender ideology	12.28	2.94	13.21	2.83
Hours in paid employment	19.19	20.01	33.81	22.92
Married	0.91	0.28	0.91	0.29
Relationship duration	15.92	14.92	15.96	15.21
Self-rated health	4.01	0.82	4.04	0.86
Age	40.47	14.97	43.21	15.81
Education	12.57	2.82	12.73	3.38
Children born	2.18	1.79	2.07	1.83
African American	0.11	0.32	0.13	0.34
Hispanic	0.08	0.27	0.08	0.26
Other	0.02	0.12	0.01	0.11
No religion	0.06	0.23	0.10	0.30
Catholic	0.26	0.44	0.25	0.43
Jewith	0.02	0.14	0.02	0.15
Conservative protestant	0.36	0.48	0.35	0.48
Other religion	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.10
Total couple income, logged	3.31	1.10	3.23	1.11
N	4065		3452	

Table 2: Relationship Between Hours of Reported Housework and Coital Frequency, Women

	1	2	3	4
Hours of Household Tasks	0.002**	0.002**	0.002**	0.002**
	(2.84)	(2.78)	(3.24)	(3.18)
Gender ideology		0.006		0.007
		(0.84)		(1.06)
Hours in paid employment			0.002*	0.002*
			(2.05)	(2.17)
Married	-0.222***	-0.225***	-0.218***	-0.221***
	(-4.09)	(-4.13)	(-4.02)	(-4.07)
Relationship duration	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003
	(-1.63)	(-1.66)	(-1.52)	(-1.55)
Self-rated health	0.102***	0.102***	0.100***	0.101***
	(5.12)	(5.17)	(5.02)	(5.08)
Age	-0.027***	-0.028***	-0.027***	-0.027***
	(-13.99)	(-13.91)	(-13.8)	(-13.75)
Education	-0.003	-0.002	-0.004	-0.003
	(-0.45)	(-0.29)	(-0.55)	(-0.35)
N of children born	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001
	(-0.16)	(-0.2)	(-0.08)	(-0.12)
African American †	0.027	0.028	0.016	0.016
	(0.5)	(0.51)	(0.29)	(0.3)
Hispanic †	-0.149*	-0.157*	-0.152*	-0.162*
	(-2.28)	(-2.45)	(-2.32)	(-2.54)
Other race/ethnicity †	-0.258	-0.261	-0.26	-0.264
	(-1.86)	(-1.89)	(-1.88)	(-1.91)
No religion ‡	-0.052	-0.047	-0.051	-0.046
	(-0.73)	(-0.67)	(-0.72)	(-0.64)
Catholic ‡	-0.128**	-0.127**	-0.132**	-0.131**
	(-2.82)	(-2.81)	(-2.9)	(-2.89)
Jewish ‡	-0.026	-0.024	-0.023	-0.02
	(-0.23)	(-0.21)	(-0.2)	(-0.17)
Conservative Protestant ‡	-0.002	-0.005	-0.003	-0.007
	(-0.06)	(-0.14)	(-0.09)	(-0.2)
Other religion ‡	0.141	0.14	0.139	0.136
	(0.92)	(0.91)	(0.91)	(0.89)
Total couple income, logged	0.025	0.026	0.021	0.022
	(1.18)	(1.22)	(1.01)	(1.04)
Intercept	2.491***	2.413***	2.457***	2.353***
	(18.27)	(15.11)	(17.86)	(14.36)
N	4065	4065	4065	4065

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001, two-tailed tests
Coefficients are regression estimates, significance statistics are in parentheses
† Reference is non-Hispanic White; ‡ Reference is Protestant

Table 3: Relationship Between Hours of Reported Housework and Coital Frequency, Men

	1	2	3	4
Hours of Household Tasks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.14)	(-0.05)	(0.09)
Gender ideology		0.011		0.011
		(1.56)		(1.57)
Hours in paid employment			0.00	0.00
			(-0.36)	(-0.38)
Married	-0.191**	-0.194**	-0.19**	-0.193**
	(-3.21)	(-3.27)	(-3.18)	(-3.24)
Relationship duration	-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.015***
	(-6.08)	(-6.16)	(-6.11)	(-6.19)
Self-rated health	0.091***	0.093***	0.092***	0.093***
	(4.16)	(4.22)	(4.14)	(4.21)
Age	-0.017***	-0.017***	-0.017***	-0.017***
	(-8.33)	(-8.39)	(-7.94)	(-8.01)
Education	-0.007	-0.006	-0.007	-0.006
	(-0.98)	(-0.83)	(-0.97)	(-0.82)
N of children born	0.027*	0.025*	0.027*	0.026*
	(2.21)	(2.09)	(2.22)	(2.10)
African American †	-0.142*	-0.14*	-0.142*	-0.141*
	(-2.46)	(-2.42)	(-2.46)	(-2.43)
Hispanic †	-0.038	-0.052	-0.038	-0.053
	(-0.50)	(-0.67)	(-0.50)	(-0.68)
Other race/ethnicity †	-0.301*	-0.312*	-0.303*	-0.314*
	(-2.05)	(-2.12)	(-2.06)	(-2.13)
No religion ‡	0.174**	0.178**	0.173**	0.177**
	(2.63)	(2.69)	(2.62)	(2.68)
Catholic ‡	0.054	0.054	0.055	0.055
	(1.09)	(1.10)	(1.10)	(1.11)
Jewish ‡	-0.048	-0.041	-0.048	-0.041
	(-0.42)	(-0.36)	(-0.42)	(-0.36)
Conservative Protestant ‡	0.164***	0.158**	0.164***	0.157**
	(3.42)	(3.27)	(3.41)	(3.26)
Other religion ‡	0.371*	0.353*	0.371*	0.353*
	(2.21)	(2.09)	(2.21)	(2.09)
Total couple income, logged	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.014
	(0.53)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.66)
Intercept	2.263***	2.113***	2.274***	2.125***
	(15.12)	(11.92)	(14.77)	(11.64)
N	3452	3452	3452	3452

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001, two-tailed tests
Coefficients are regression estimates, significance statistics are in parentheses
† Reference is non-Hispanic White; ‡ Reference is Protestant

Figure 1: Histogram of Coital Frequency